

Remarks

Claims 1-7 remain pending. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kato et al. (US Patent 6,738,835 B1). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has herein amended claim 3. No new matter is believed added.

Please note that item 9 on the cover sheet of the Office Action indicates an objection in the specification. However, the Office did not detail any such objection. Clarification is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 3, a typographical error has been corrected in the above amendment section to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112. Applicant also respectfully traverses the 35 USC 102(e) rejections and submits that all claims are allowable over the cited art. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. For instance, claim 1 recites: "A method for executing a re-configuration in a self-configuring digital network after occurrence of a reconfiguration trigger, through upon detecting such trigger, communicating between various physical nodes their respective logical node identifiers and furthermore communicating functionality informations regarding the respective node stations,

said method being characterized by, associated to such detecting, recognizing in a particular node such other nodes that before such trigger had been conducting a communication relation with said particular node, *marking all logical node mappings* on the various physical nodes as invalid, through said *communicating* of logical node

identifiers establishing said reconfiguration, whilst executing the communicating of said functionality informations *on a basis of necessity*. ”

As explained in the second paragraph, page 4 of the present application, the present invention applies “selective topology,” which allows the network to “stabilize,” “reduce the number of network accesses,” and “increase overall efficiency” (line 8; lines 25-28). To achieve such benefits, the claimed invention proposes and operates to “only update the required information of the communicating nodes” (line 15) because the inventor has recognized that it is “generally not necessary to update all functionality information” (lines 11-12). Each node, according to the claimed invention, only has to store the additional information of the node or nodes it has “a communication relation with” (lines 15-17). When the reconfiguration trigger is detected, the inventive idea is “to take no actions on the network, but to only mark all available mappings as invalid” (lines 17-18). If the node in question has to communicate with another node marked invalid, the former will check whether the original mapping of the node on a particular device is still valid, through an information query to the corresponding node, and it will “only selectively update the mapping according to necessity” (lines 19-23).

In contrast, Kato teaches a method and system substantially different from the current claimed invention. For example, in SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION, Kato teaches, *inter alia*, in its acquisition step to acquire “a change of the connection state of *each* electronic device to a bus constituting the bus system” (column 2, lines 16-18). In its second embodiment, Kato repeatedly teaches to send out the node unique ID or the command packet with regard to the *entire* devices after occurrence of the bus reset: “Such transmission of the node unique ID after the bus reset in this routine is executed

with regard to the entire devices (in the example of FIG. 11, controllers 11, 81 and target devices 13, 14, 82) connected to the bus system" (column 6, lines 23-27); "At step S33, the control unit 55 sends a command packet . . . to the entire devices connected to the bus system within a lapse of one second after occurrence of the bus reset" (column 6, lines 42-45); "Subsequently at step S34, the control unit 55 receives the node unique ID sent thereto at step S31 from the entire devices connected to the bus system" (column 6, lines 49-51); "More specifically, the processes from step S38 through step S40 are executed repeatedly until the entire device drivers for controlling the removed target devices are deleted completely from the bus system" (column 7, lines 50-53).


It is evident that Kato fails to teach the claimed invention, *inter alia*, ". . . marking all logical node mappings on the various physical nodes as invalid, through said communicating of logical node identifiers establishing said reconfiguration, whilst executing the communicating of said functionality informations on a basis of necessity." Accordingly, claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are believed allowable. Claim 6 and the dependent claim 7 are believed allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance.  
If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

6/21/05



Michael F. Hoffman  
Reg. No. 40,019

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
Three E-Comm Square  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile